



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DOW Jun-05

PRAXAIR INC
LAW DEPT - MI557
39 OLD RIDGEBURY ROAD
DANBURY CT 06810-5113

COPY MAILED

JUN 03 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Notaro et al. :
Application No. 09/664,390 : ON PETITION
Filed: 18 September, 2000 :
Atty Docket No. 20846 :

This is a decision on the petition filed 26 April, 2005, under 37 CFR 1.137(a)¹ to revive the above-identified application, which is first treated as a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment.

The petition is **dismissed**.

The application became abandoned on 10 July, 2003, for failure to timely submit the issue fee as required by the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due mailed on 9 April, 2003, which set a three (3) month statutory period for reply. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 19 August, 2003.

¹ A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed; In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(1);

(3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(a) was unavoidable; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

Petitioners assert that a timely reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) were filed by facsimile on 25 June, 2003. In support, petitioners have provided a copy of the RCE Transmittal form showing a facsimile timestamp dated "Jun 25."

37 CFR 1.6 states, in pertinent part:

1.6 Receipt of correspondence.

(a) Date of receipt and Express Mail date of deposit.

Correspondence received in the Patent and Trademark Office is stamped with the date of receipt except as follows:

(1) The Patent and Trademark Office is not open for the filing of correspondence on any day that is a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday within the District of Columbia. Except for correspondence transmitted by facsimile under paragraph (a)(3) of this section, or filed electronically under paragraph (a)(4) of this section, no correspondence is received in the Office on Saturdays, Sundays, or Federal holidays within the District of Columbia.

(2) Correspondence filed in accordance with § 1.10 will be stamped with the date of deposit as "Express Mail" with the United States Postal Service.

(3) Correspondence transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office will be stamped with the date on which the complete transmission is received in the Patent and Trademark Office unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday within the District of Columbia, in which case the date stamped will be the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday within the District of Columbia.

(4) [Reserved]

(b) [Reserved]

(c) Correspondence delivered by hand. In addition to being mailed, correspondence may be delivered by hand during hours the Office is open to receive correspondence.

(d) Facsimile transmission . Except in the cases enumerated below, correspondence, including authorizations to charge a deposit account, may be transmitted by facsimile. The receipt date accorded to the correspondence will be the date on which the complete transmission is received in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, unless that date is a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday within the District of Columbia. See § 1.6(a)(3). To facilitate proper processing, each transmission session should be limited to correspondence to be filed in a single application or other proceeding before the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The application number of a patent

application, the control number of a reexamination proceeding, the interference number of an interference proceeding, or the patent number of a patent should be entered as a part of the sender's identification on a facsimile cover sheet. Facsimile transmissions are not permitted and, if submitted, will not be accorded a date of receipt in the following situations:

- (1) Correspondence as specified in § 1.4(e), requiring an original signature;
- (2) Certified documents as specified in § 1.4(f);
- (3) Correspondence which cannot receive the benefit of the certificate of mailing or transmission as specified in § 1.8(a)(2)(i)(A) through (D) and (F), and § 1.8(a)(2)(iii)(A), except that a continued prosecution application under § 1.53(d) may be transmitted to the Office by facsimile;
- (4) Drawings submitted under §§ 1.81, 1.83 through 1.85, 1.152, 1.165, 1.174, or 1.437;
- (5) A request for reexamination under § 1.510 or § 1.913;
- (6) Correspondence to be filed in a patent application subject to a secrecy order under §§ 5.1 through 5.5 of this chapter and directly related to the secrecy order content of the application;
- (7) [Reserved]
- (8) [Reserved]
- (9) Correspondence to be filed in an interference proceeding which consists of a preliminary statement under § 1.621; a transcript of a deposition under § 1.676 or of interrogatories, or cross-interrogatories; or an evidentiary record and exhibits under § 1.653.

37 CFR 1.8 states, in pertinent part:

§ 1.8 Certificate of mailing or transmission.

(a) Except in the cases enumerated in paragraph (a)(2) of this section, correspondence required to be filed in the Patent and Trademark Office within a set period of time will be considered as being timely filed if the procedure described in this section is followed. The actual date of receipt will be used for all other purposes.

(1) Correspondence will be considered as being timely filed if:

(i) The correspondence is mailed or transmitted prior to expiration of the set period of time by being:

(A) Addressed as set out in § 1.1(a) and deposited with

the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail; or

(B) Transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with § 1.6(d); and

(ii) The correspondence includes a certificate for each piece of correspondence stating the date of deposit or transmission.

The person signing the certificate should have reasonable basis to expect that the correspondence would be mailed or transmitted on or before the date indicated.

The showing of record is that petitioners did not use a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission in accordance with 37 CFR 1.8. Although petitioners' reply bears a facsimile transmission report dated "Jun 25 '0," petitioners clearly did not comply with 37 CFR 1.8 in that a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission was not completed on the RCE Transmittal form, or on any of the other papers submitted therewith. As petitioners did not include a proper Certificate of Mailing or Transmission with the reply, the correspondence cannot be considered to have been filed on 25 June, 2003. Additionally, the last digit of the year on the date on the facsimile transmission report has been obscured such that the year of transmission cannot be determined. Further, the fax number to which the RCE was sent, according to the facsimile transmission report, 703-305-7718, does not appear to be an official facsimile number for filing responses to Office actions.

More to the point, however, failure to include the Certificate of Mailing or Transmission constitutes an error on the part of petitioners.

In summary, the showing of record suggests, at best, that petitioners intended to timely file an RCE. However, it is unclear to whom the RCE was sent, or the year in which it was filed. Additionally, petitioners failed to include a Certificate of Mailing or Facsimile Transmission. As such error was one on the part of petitioners, the holding of abandonment cannot be withdrawn, and the petition is dismissed.

PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(a)

At the outset, the petition lacks the required reply. With the present petition, petitioners filed a RCE under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114, including a submission in the form of an IDS. The Office notes that payment of the issue fee is the required reply in order to revive the application for failure to submit a timely response to the Notice of Allowance. Accordingly, the \$1,400.00 issue fee must be submitted with any renewed petition.

Petitioners are advised that the issue fee paid in the present application cannot be refunded. However, if the application is allowed again, petitioner may request that the \$1,80.00 be applied towards the issue fee required by the new Notice of Allowance.²

The Commissioner may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding Office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to be "unavoidable".³ Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.⁴

² The request to apply the issue fee to the new Notice of Allowance must be made in writing and should be accompanied by the new Issue Fee Transmittal Form (PTOL-85(b)), along with a copy of this decision. Additionally, if the issue fee has increased from the previously paid issue fee, the balance due at the time of payment must be submitted. Failure to timely request in writing that the previously paid issue fee be applied towards the new Notice of Allowance and payment of any balance due will result in the abandonment of the application.

³ 35 U.S.C. § 133.

⁴ In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).⁵ Specifically, an application is "unavoidably" abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, facsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office.⁶

The showing of record is that petitioners failed to follow the procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8. A delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP does not constitute an "unavoidable" delay.⁶ A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to: (1) the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from Office employees; or (2) the Office's failure to advise the applicant of any deficiency in sufficient time to permit the applicant to take corrective action.⁷

In summary, the showing of record is that the abandonment resulted from a mistake on the part of petitioners in not properly filing a timely response to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due rather than as a result of unavoidable delay. As the showing presented is insufficient to establish unavoidable

USPO 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

⁵ See MPEP 711(c)(III)(C)(2) for a discussion of the requirements for a showing of unavoidable delay.

⁶ Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887).

⁶ See Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987), Vincent v. Mossinghoff, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); Smith v. Diamond, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); Potter v. Dann, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891).

⁷ See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985); see also In re Colombo, Inc., 33 USPQ2d 1530, 1532 (Comm'r Pat. 1994) (while the Office attempts to notify applicants of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction, the Office has no obligation to notify parties of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction).

delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a). Thus, the petition will be dismissed.

ALTERNATIVE VENUE

Petitioners may wish to consider filing a renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b),⁸ which now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The filing of a petition under the unintentional standard cannot be intentionally delayed and therefore should be filed promptly.

A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

A copy of the form for filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive an application unintentionally abandoned is enclosed herewith for petitioners' convenience.

⁸ Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: (703) 872-9306
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window
Mail Stop Petitions
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries related to this decision should be directed to the undersigned at 571-272-3231.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: Form PTO/SB/64
Privacy Act Statement